DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 906 HE 003 001

AUTHOR	McCabe, M. Patrick; Driscoll, Brian
TITLE	College Admission Opportunities and the Public Offender.
INSTITUTION	Morehead State Univ., Ky.
PUB DATE	30 Sep 71
NOTE	32p.; Paper presented to the American Association of College Admission Counselors, San Francisco, California, September 30, 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; *Correctional Education; Correctional Rehabilitation; *Criminals; *Higher Education; *Prisoners

ABSTRACT

The University of Kentucky's Project NewGate is 1 of 6 federally funded demonstration projects in correctional education designed to (1) provide an intensive college preparatory and college-level educational program for a select number of federal prisoners at the Federal Youth Center in Ashland, Kentucky; (2) supplement the educational component with individual and group counseling sessions; and (3) extend the program beyond the release date through realistic prerelease planning and intensive postrelease followup. Accomplishments of the NewGate Program have been: (1) a total of 109 NewGate students have been successfully placed in academic and technical institutions following their release; (2) 4 former NewGate students have completed vocational training programs and are currently employed in related trades; (3) 1 NewGate student has received an Associate of Arts degree; (4) an additional 42 NewGate students have found satisfactory employment. Only 9 out of the 109 releases have failed to make satisfactory adjustment to the outside world. (Author/HS)

ED 061906

College Admission Opportunities

and the Public Offender

M. Patrick McCabe
Brian Driscoll

Presented to the:

American Association of College

Admission Counselors

September 30, 1971

San Francisco, California

HE 003 001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

College Admission Opportunities

and the Public Offender

M. Patrick McCabe
Brian Driscoll

Presented to the:

American Association of College

Admission Counselors

September 30, 1971

San Francisco, California

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Project NewGate: An Innovation in Correctional Education	8
III.	Admission Practices of Colleges and Universities in Regard to Paroled Ex-Offenders	17
IV.	Summary and Conclusions	25

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Elementary and Secondary Education Programs Operating Within U.S. Correctional Institutions	1
Table 2	College Education Within U.S. Correctional Institutions	2
Table 3	College Programs by Type of Instruction	3
Table 4	Number and Type of College Degrees	4
Table 5	A Comparison of College Courses Offered in U.S. Prisons in 1967 and 1968	4
Table 6	Percentage of Academic Institutions Reporting to The Admission Questionnaire	18
Table 7	Percentage of Institutions Responding to the Admission Questionnaire by Geographical Region	18
Table 8	Percentage of Academic Institutions Responding to the Questionnaire by Type of Institution	19
Table 9	Response to the Admission Questionnaire by All Reporting Academic Institutions	20
Table 10	Response to the Admission Questionnaire by Geographical Region	21
Table 11	List of States with Crime Rates Falling in Lowest Five in at Least One Index Category	22
Table 12	List of States with Crime Rates Falling in Highest Five in at Least One Index Category	23
Table 13	Admission Policies Concerning Ex-Felons by Type of Institution Reporting	24

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

Correctional education has been a part of our modern day penal system for several years[1], and it is generally accepted by professionals and laymen alike that in one form or another education can and will play a vital role in the rehabilitation of certain types of convicted criminals. Consequently, an ever increasing number of elementary, high school, and university programs are being developed within various types of state and federal correctional treatment programs around the country.

A 1968 research project designed to measure the extent and content of such programs uncovered some rather remarkable data concerning college preparatory and college level programs.[2] As Table 1 indicates, the survey reported 445 high school and elementary programs in operation servicing 77,469 inmates. The majority of these programs are either non-accredited or concentrate on G.E.D. preparation. However, high school degrees are offered at 146 of the reporting institutions.

Table 1
Elementary and Secondary
Educational Programs Operating
Within U.S. Correctional Institutions

Number of Reporting Institutions	Total Number of Elementary and Secondary Programs	Total Number of Elementary and Secondary Students	Total No. High School Degrees
590	445	77,469	146

[1]For a detailed discussion of the history of correctional education in the U.S. see D.W. Morris, "The University's Role in Prison Education," Nebraska Law Review, 1966, pp. 542-571.

[2]M. Patrick McCabe, "Correctional Education in the United States," Project NewGate Publication, Federal Youth Center, Ashland, Kentucky, 1970.

Preparation at this level is very appropriate considering the high percentage of convicted law violators who fail to satisfactorily complete formal elementary and secondary programs. Certainly, it is mandatory if college programs are to be added to the curriculum.

Correctional college programs in several forms are in fact very much in evidence in the United States. As can be seen in Table 2, a total of 148 institutions reported college programs which currently involve 3,757 inmate-students.

Table 2
College Education Within
U.S. Correctional Institutions

Number of Reporting Institutions	Number of College Programs	Number of College Students	Number of College Degrees
590	148	3,757	26

More importantly, however, as is indicated in Table 3, a total of 84 of these programs involve some form of live instruction. The most widely used program is one which is conducted by visiting instructors within the institution, but a significant number of study-release programs are developing which allow the student to attend classes "on-campus" during the day and return to the institution at night.

Table 3
College Programs
By Type of Institutions

Program Description	Number of Programs	Number of Students
Correspondence Only	66	927
Live Instruction Only	31	1,142
Correspondence and Live Instruction	26	1,223
Study Release Only	5	76
Study Release and Correspondence	8	128
Study Release and Live Instruction	4	128
Study Release, Live Instruction and Correspondence	3	104
No Descriptive Response	4	29
Total	138	3,757

College degrees (Table 4), although not plentiful, are offered at 26 different institutions. The Associate of Arts degree which is generally reserved for programs combining academic and vocational training (such as industrial technology, secretarial science, nursing, etc.) is the most common of these degrees. However, one Bachelor of Arts and one junior college degree is offered, and two other institutions are in the process of planning full four-year programs.

Table 4
Number and Type
of
College Degrees

Degree Description	Number
Associate of Arts	18
Two-year Business	1
Junior College	1
B.A.	1
Other*	
*The responding institution described these degrees in a variety of ways including "all types," "two-year," and "handled by college."	
Total	26

One indication of the rapid growth of college programs is shown in Table 5 which compares the results of the current project (1968) with a similar project conducted by Dr. Stuart Adams[3] during the fall of 1967. Although the methodology of the two projects differed considerably, it can readily be seen that college-level instruction within U.S. correctional institutions has increased significantly in recent months.

Table 5
A Comparison of College
Courses Offered in U.S.
Prisons in 1967 and 1968*

Year	Correspondence Courses	Live Instruction	Study Release	Total
1967	27	17	3	47
1968-69	103	64	20	187

*The column totals for 1968 exceed the original number of institutions reporting college programs since several of these institutions offer two or more types of programs.

[3]Stuart Adams, College Level Instruction in U.S. Prisons, University of California School of Criminology, January 1968.

At the present time, only a small percentage of the country's 460,000[4] state and federal prisoners are being served by these programs. Furthermore, the 3,757 college inmate-students represent a mere fraction of the 8,498,000 students currently enrolled in colleges and universities throughout the United States.[5] However, by any standard of comparison, the above statistics indicate that the educational programs within U S. Correctional Institutions are becoming quite widespread. Whether measured by the absolute number of programs now available or the number of inmates which they serve, these programs are becoming increasingly more important within the overall treatment program. If the present rate of increase continues, it is quite possible that the majority of U.S. inmates will will some day soon have the opportunity to complete their entire elementary and high school education and a portion of their college degree requirements during their period of incarceration.

It is with the future of these current and potential college students that we will concern ourselves with today. Students of penology have long been aware of the tragic loss of continuity which so often fails to bridge the gap between institutional programs that are designed to remedy academic and training deficiencies and post-release programs which allow the individual to utilize his new found skills.

College level instruction is certainly no exception. If an inmate remedies his academic deficiencies and begins a college level program while

---

[4] 1970 Jail Census U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, p. 1. Also, "The Shame of Prisons" Time, January 18, 1971.

[5] Data obtained from Dr. Grant W. Vance, HEW, Reference Estimates and Projection Branch

confined but is refused admission to an appropriate college or university following his release, the continuity is again broken. Once this occurs, the most modern and effective of all institutional programs becomes totally impotent as a rehabilitative tool.

During the past five years, a small but highly effective program known as Project NewGate has been depending on the cooperation of various colleges and universities for its very survival. Designed essentially as an educational and counseling program, NewGate has the added feature of college placement and fieldwork followup for each released student. Consequently, college acceptance of each released student is a must if the project is to achieve its objective.

This problem is remedied rather easily in the majority of the projects, since they are operated by a state university in conjunction with a state correctional facility. The logical movement from one state facility to another is performed with a minimum of difficulty. However, the NewGate project with which your authors are presently affiliated is considerably more complex in its operation.

The Kentucky NewGate project is operated by the University of Kentucky within the Federal Youth Center at Ashland, Kentucky. Since this is a federal rather than a state institution, the Ashland center receives committments from all 26 states east of the Mississippi. Thus, the NewGate student body consists of students from a wide geographical range who for the most part will be wanting to return to their homes following release. Such a situation naturally complicates post-release planning and followup.

Instead of dealing with a single university during our past two years of operation, our 109 releasees have been admitted to a total of 98 different schools. This is quite a task when one considers that it is often necessary to contact several institutions before acceptance is granted.

In an effort to facilitate the problem of searching for appropriate and inviting centers of higher education, a questionnaire concerning admission policies was sent out during the 1970-71 project year to each of the colleges and universities in the United States. As a result, the data gathered through this inquiry was tabulated and listed in a directory entitled A Study of Admissions Practices of Colleges and Universities In Regard to Paroled Ex-Offenders. Mr. Driscoll was the principal research figure and author of this work.

The purpose of our presentation today will be to discuss briefly both the experiences of the NewGate project in college admissions and the results of Mr. Driscoll's survey. Our paper will be primarily descriptive in nature with the express intent to generate further consideration and deliberation of an area that is becoming crucial to a significant portion of current correctional programming.

SECTION II

PROJECT NEWGATE: AN INNOVATION IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

Project Description

The University of Kentucky's Project NewGate is one of six federally funded demonstration projects in correctional education designed to: (1) provide an intensive college preparatory and college level educational program for a select number of federal prisoners at the Federal Youth Center in Ashland, Kentucky, (2) supplement the educational component with intensive individual and group counseling sessions, and (3) extend the program beyond the release date through realistic pre-release planning and intensive post-release followup. The remaining five NewGate projects are located in Oregon, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Colorado, and Minnesota. Created initially as an extension of the Upward Bound Program, Project NewGate now operates as an independent program under the direction of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Purpose

The purpose of the NewGate Project is to determine the value of appropriate post high school education in the rehabilitative efforts of correctional institutions. Common sense would lead one to believe that education could produce nothing but positive results; however, many such common sense opinions have proven false when put to the empirical test. Therefore, it is the purpose of this project to determine whether the educational process is the key to developing confined individuals into useful, contributing citizens or whether such a program merely provides a means for promoting and/or conditioning their pursuit of a criminal career.

NewGate Students

A total of one hundred and ninety-five (195) students have been enrolled in the NewGate Program since its inception on June 1, 1969. The two major selection criteria used for these students are a mandatory 8.0 S.A.T. score and an IQ of 95 or above. Other considerations such as offense, institutional adjustment, and length of stay play only a minor role in determining eligibility. Thus, it is the purpose of this project to determine the impact of such a program upon all varities of confined youth regardless of their past records and potential for future success.

The NewGate Program

The NewGate Program consists of two fifteen week regular sessions and a ten week summer session during which a variety of academic, counseling, and related training activities are scheduled. Academic work begins at the G.E.D. level for those who have not completed high school, continues through special college courses offered both inside the Federal Youth Center and at the nearby Ashland Community College.

Counseling at both the individual and group level is encouraged from the moment a student enters the program. Various counseling techniques are employed by the staff in an attempt to bring to the individual a realistic awareness of his present and future capabilities. Once such a self awareness is gained, intensive efforts are made to correct weaknesses which might later lead to failure in the outside world.

Effective pre-release planning and post-release followup is essential to the success of correctional programming at all levels. Too often an individual begins a training program within an institution but fails to capitalize upon his new skills following release. To avoid this situation,

comprehensive release plan is established several months prior to the parole date. This plan includes admission to an appropriate school, housing, and the permission of the local probation officer operating in that district. After release, the NewGate fieldworker periodically checks each placement in an effort to confirm that each committment is fulfilled.

Accomplishments of the NewGate Program

1. A total of 109 NewGate students have been successfully placed in academic and technical institutions following their release. These schools include:

University of Kentucky-Study Center (7)

University of North Carolina
Charlotte, North Carolina

Ohio State University - Branch
Lima, Ohio

Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio

Indiana University - Branch
Terre Haute, Indiana

Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Columbia College
Chicago, Illinois

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

University of Akron
Akron, Ohio

Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia

Bernard Baruch University
New York City, New York

Long Island University
Long Island, New York, New York

Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Memphis State College
Memphis, Tennessee

Lakelawn Community College
Painesville, Ohio

Jefferson Community College
Louisville, Kentucky

Glenn Oaks Community College
Centreville, Michigan

Frederick Community College
Frederick, Maryland

Montgomery Jr. College
Tacoma Park, Maryland

Lincoln Land Community College
Springfield, Illinois

Community College of Baltimore
Baltimore, Maryland

Bronx Community College
New York City, New York

Sauk Valley Community College
Dixon, Illinois

Prince George Community College
Largo, Maryland

Brookdale Community College
New Jersey

Macomb Community College
Warren, Michigan

Indiana Technical Institute
Indianapolis, Indiana

Owensboro Trade School
Owensboro, Kentucky

Northwood Institute
Midland, Michigan

Jefferson County Vocational School
Louisville, Kentucky

Vocational Trade School
Chicago, Illinois

2. Four former NewGate students have completed vocational training programs and are currently employed in related trades.

3. One NewGate student has received an Associate of Arts degree.

In addition to these placements, a total of 42 NewGate students have found satisfactory employment. Only nine out of the 109 releasees have failed to make satisfactory adjustment to the outside world.

Current programming calls for rigidly structured format designed to effectively utilize the abilities and talents of the NewGate staff. A significant innovation involves the development of a post-release study center on the University of Kentucky campus. This innovation along with a number of others has been a result of the many lessons learned throughout the first two calendar years of operation. Future programming and design will continue to incorporate such knowledge.

Characteristics of the Fall 1971 NewGate Class

Total Number of Students			40
Average Age			21
IQ Range	130 - Above	1	
	125 - 129	2	
	120 - 124	5	
	115 - 119	8	
	110 - 114	14	
	105 - 109	3	
	100 - 104	7	
	Total	40	
IQ Average	114		
Grade Attainment			
College Work	6		
H.S. Degree	18		
G.E.D.	16		

NewGate Experiences with College Admissions

Generally speaking, the Project NewGate staff has been quite successful in dealing with admissions offices in all parts of the country. In addition to the 109 placements mentioned previously, an additional 23 acceptances have been received for students who eventually decided to go elsewhere.

There have been, however, a total of 15 schools who have either outrightly refused admission or have required additional screening and interviews in dealing with NewGate students. Although a variety of reasons were given for these actions, two examples are rather typical of the problems encountered in these situations.

The first negative experience encountered by the Kentucky NewGate staff involved, oddly enough, the original host university. Morehead State University received the NewGate grant in June of 1969. The following September marked the appearance of the first NewGate student on campus. This admission was processed with considerable ease since the project was new, and one student was barely noticed on campus.

One year later, four more students were recommended for admission. At this time, the Director of Admissions travelled to the Federal Youth Center and personally approved each candidate. Once again, the admissions were made with relative ease.

During the ensuing semester several events occurred which caused the university administration to look more closely at the NewGate students. One problem involved a number of "cold" checks which were being passed by a NewGate student. The other situation involved a NewGate student's involvement in a campus "panty raid."

Following these two events, a number of events occurred almost simultaneously. First, an emergency meeting was held to determine the future of NewGate on campus. Second, once the decision was made to retain the project, it was decided that the admission policies would be changed to provide a much closer screening of all NewGate students. Third, in accordance with this new policy the following events occurred prior to admitting students for the winter term, (1) the Director of Admissions travelled to Ashland and interviewed each prospective student, (2) the Admissions Director returned with the Dean of Student Affairs and a University Vice-President for a second interview, (3) the NewGate students were taken to Morehead where they were interviewed by the President, each

of the Vice-Presidents, each Dean, and several department heads. This was accomplished by setting up a number of tables containing several administrators and requiring each NewGate student to visit each table during the interview session. Then, the administrators assembled, after all the students had been seen, and voted on admission. Ironically, after all of this, only one student was rejected. This student was a Jewish boy from New York who was passed over with the statement, "We're all Baptists around here."

The second situation also concerned a Kentucky school, Western Kentucky University. The student in question was a hometown boy. His wife was currently enrolled at the school. The first request from Western concerned supplying the admissions department with all of the student's confidential records. This request was met except for information which is confidential by law. Second, a request was made for a personal interview. This request was also met in spite of the 285 miles separating the two institutions. During the interview, a local lawyer was present who made several negative comments about supporting ex-offenders who plan to go to college. Finally, a letter of rejection was sent without one word of explanation.

These two cases are, admittedly, extreme examples. They serve, however, to point out some of the obstacles which ex-offenders must overcome regardless of their present or future plans. Our correctional system has through history been conceived as a device through which men are confined as punishment for an act against society. Once these actions are taken and the unfit is removed from among the law-abiding citizenry, our laws have been ritualized and justice prevails. Unfortunately for the offender, this

stereotype carries over to the time of release. Once again, an undesirable element has been released to corrupt, rob, and molest those around him. Such fears and suspicions inevitably effect the life of each offender regardless of his progress either before or after release. This can be especially damaging to a student who has worked hard to prove himself academically and socially capable of handling college work, only to find his academic progress halted by the raft of misconceptions which have contributed so heavily to the rising recidivism rates.

SECTION III

ADMISSIONS PRACTICES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN REGARD TO PAROLED EX-OFFENDERS

Introduction

As reported earlier in this paper, the idea for the ex-offender admissions survey initially grew out of necessity. Applying for admission to various colleges and universities can be a very time consuming and costly practice if there are no guidelines for admission policies. The survey was expected to serve this need.

Once the data were assembled, it became obvious that the implications for research and planning went beyond the pragmatic stage. Although the response to the questionnaire was well below the expected level, a number of patterns emerged which could very well have a significant impact on the future planning of college prison programs. The matter certainly involves further investigation.

Methodology

The data for the directory were gathered through the use of a structured questionnaire sent to each of the 2,193 schools of higher education in the United States. Each questionnaire contained a list of ten questions which related to various aspects of admitting ex-offenders to college. From these questions eight responses were selected to be included in the directory. The present study is designed to analyze five of these eight items.

Results

As Table 6 indicates a total of 705 usable responses were made to the questionnaire. Actually, 758 schools returned the required forms, but 53

were either partially or totally incomplete. Although the 32% response is somewhat below our original expectations, it does present sufficient data to indicate several distinct patterns.

Table 6
Percentage of Academic Institutions
Reporting to
The Admission Questionnaire

NUMBER CONTACTED	NUMBER REPORTING	PERCENTAGE
2193	705	32%

Regional differences in responses (Table 7) show a significantly higher response coming from the midlands (Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, etc.) and a rather sharp decrease from our Northeast corner (Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, etc.). The differences were especially seen in states such as Minnesota (49%), Nebraska (46%), Maine (10%), and Massachusetts (14%).

Table 7
Percentage of Institutions
Responding to the Admission Questionnaire
by Geographical Region

GEOGRAPHICAL REGION	NUMBER CONTACTED	NUMBER RESPONDING	PERCENTAGE
Northeast	553	137	25%
North Central	643	240	39%
South	663	214	32%
West	334	114	34%
TOTAL	2193	705	32%

Apparently, the type of academic institution responding has little effect on the return rate (Table 8). Although differing markedly in absolute numbers, the percentage of returns was nearly identical.

Table 8
Percentage of Academic Institutions
Responding to the Questionnaire
by Type of Institution

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	NUMBER CONTACTED	NUMBER RESPONDING	PERCENTAGE
University	363	115	32%
College	1051	336	32%
Junior or Community College	779	254	33%
TOTAL	2193	705	32%

The analysis of the questionnaire itself brought forth some rather revealing information about our college and university system. Table 9 points out a number of these characteristics. Chief among these are (1) the admissions policy generally allows for admission for some ex-offenders but the prior criminal record is definitely taken into account, and (2) schools in general are not interested in individuals with pending court hearings.

Table 9
Response to the Admission
Questionnaire by All Reporting
Academic Institutions

QUESTION	RESPONSE		PERCENTAGE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
1. Will you accept an individual that has been found guilty of committing a felong?	528	157	78%	22%
2. Does your college or university admit as students those persons who are awaiting trial for an alleged criminal offense?	252	453	35%	65%
3. Does your college or university take into consideration the past criminal record of an applicant for admission?	500	205	71%	29%
4. Does the existence of a past criminal record automatically disqualify an applicant?	130	575	18%	82%
5. Is the past criminal record of an applicant a major factor in regards to his admission?	376	329	53%	47%

These statistics become even more meaningful when controlled for regionalization (Table 10). Although the Northeast and North Central sections of the country stay quite close to the national norm, the South and West vary considerably. In each instance, the Western states indicate a highly liberal attitude toward ex-offenders while the exact opposite is true in the South. This is all the more remarkable when one considers that California is listed as having the highest incidence of crime in the United States, while with the exception of Maryland and Florida (number 3 and 5) no other southern state ranks above the 50 percentile (Tables 11 and 12).

Table 10
Response to the Admission Questionnaire
by Geographical Region

QUESTION	U.S. CENSUS REGIONS: NORTHEAST YES	NO	% YES	% NO	NORTH CENTRAL YES	NO	% YES	% NO	SOUTH YES	NO	% YES	% NO	WEST YES	NO	% YES	% NO
1. Will you accept an individual that has been found guilty of committing a felony?	105	32	77%	33%	193	47	81%	19%	151	63	70%	30%	99	13	87%	13%
2. Does your college or university admit as students those persons who are awaiting trial for an alleged criminal offense?	46	91	34%	66%	86	154	36%	64%	57	157	23%	77%	63	51	55%	45%
3. Does your college or university take into consideration the past criminal record of an applicant for admission?	90	47	66%	34%	170	70	71%	29%	173	41	81%	19%	67	47	59%	41%
4. Does the existence of a past criminal record automatically disqualify an applicant?	27	110	20%	80%	41	199	17%	83%	43	166	22%	78%	14	100	12%	88%
5. Is the past criminal record of an applicant a major factor in regards to his admission?	73	64	53%	47%	122	118	51%	49%	136	78	64%	36%	45	69	39%	61%

Table 11
List of States with Crime Rates Falling
in Lowest Five in at Least One Index Category

States	Rank of State on Total Crime Index	Index Crime Category in which State Fell in Highest Five							
		Murder	Rape	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	Larceny Over $50	Auto Theft	Total Row
North Dakota	50	x	x	x	x	x		x	6
Mississippi	49					x	x	x	3
West Virginia	48		x			x	x	x	4
Vermont	47			x	x		x	x	4
New Hampshire	46	x	x	x	x	x	x		6
Maine	45			x			x		2
South Dakota	44					x			1
Iowa	43	x			x				2
Idaho	42			x					1
Arkansas	41							x	1
Wisconsin	40	x	x		x				3
Minnesota	22	x							1
Rhode Island	9		x						1

Table 12
List of States with Crime Rates Falling
In Highest Five in at Least One Index Category

States	Rank of State on Total Crime Index	Index Crime Category in which State Fell in Highest Five							
		Murder	Rape	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	Larceny Over $50	Auto Theft	Row Total
California	1		x	x	x	x	x	x	6
New York	2			x		x	x	x	4
Maryland	3		x	x	x	x		x	5
Nevada	4						x		1
Florida	5	x			x	x			3
Arizona	6						x		1
Hawaii	7					x			1
Michigan	8		x	x					2
Rhode Island	9							x	1
Colorado	11		x						1
Massachusetts	12							x	1
New Mexico	14						x		1
Missouri	15		x						1
Texas	19	x							1
Illinois	20			x					1
Louisiana	25				x				1
Georgia	30	x							1
Alabama	33	x							1
South Carolina	35	x							1
North Carolina	38				x				1

One further revealing statistic concerns the admission policies of types of institutions in regard to ex-felons (Table 13). The data indicate a much more responsive attitude by universities and two year colleges than by the four year colleges. This could be rather significant for two reasons: (1) many of the released inmate college students have accummulated a rather large number of credit hours while confined and are therefore unable to take advantage of a receptive two-year college system. (2) There are only one-third as many universities as four year colleges in the United States. This serves as a further limiting factor in regard to selecting appropriate institutions for each student.

Table 13
Admission Policies Concerning Ex-Felons
by Type of Institution Reporting

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	WILL ACCEPT	WILL NOT ACCEPT	PERCENTAGE OF ACCEPTANCE
University	99	18	84%
College	236	111	68%
Junior or Community College	213	28	88%
TOTAL	548	157	78% AVG.

SECTION IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In analyzing the material which has been presented in this paper, two definite yet somewhat incompatible patterns appear to be emerging. First, correctional facilities across the nation are beginning to rely more and more heavily upon post-high school education as a rehabilitative tool. This education takes many forms but an obvious movement toward college level instruction both within and outside the institution is underway. Second, although the majority of schools responding to the survey indicated a willingness to accept certain types of offenders, a similar number stated that prior criminal records do definitely play a role in the admissions process. Thus, it appears that unless machinery can be established which will open up lines of communication that will lead to a situation of mutual understanding and cooperation, a direct confrontation at a future date is inevitable. This is certainly the case in areas of the South where there is such an apparent resistance to accepting ex-offenders as college students.

One current movement which could very well accentuate this need for dual efforts in planning and programming, involves a project recently put into motion by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, NCCD will in the near future establish a NewGate Resource Center from which technical assistance can be given to each state interested in developing their own NewGate project. Current planning involves the use of the existing NewGate staff in technical assistance roles. Publicity concerning the project will be fed to each state correctional agency with the accompanying offer of complimentary assistance. Once a state

indicates an interest in the project, aid in developing programs, staffing, and securing federal assistance will be extended. If the project meets with success, there could very well be scores of NewGate projects under development within the next year.

Such a set of circumstances offers a serious challenge to the colleges and universities of our nation. Although few are programmed to specifically deal with ex-offenders, it is unquestionable that the inherent capabilities for such work are perhaps the greatest of all existing agencies. Rehabilitation and reintegration into society involves much more than a one-prong problem solving approach. The ex-offender must be assisted in handling a variety of educational, emotional, and social problems.[6] Certainly, progress can be made prior to release, but without the continuity provided by an effective follow-up program, the battle could very well be lost. This is all too apparent when the current statistics show a recidivism rate of youthful offenders to fall somewhere between 70 and 80 percent. These figures become even more staggering when it is realized that 80% of all crimes are committed by ex-offenders. One felony conviction carries a price tag of $25,000. The lifetime of an average felon will cost the taxpayers $100,000.

Kentucky's Project NewGate currently carries a recidivism rate of seven percent. The Oregon project has had only two new convictions from 136 releasees. The explanation is simple - a university and a corrections agency

---

[6] M. Patrick McCabe and Robert C. Atchley "A New Approach to the Treatment of Offenders," Sociological Focus, Vol. 1, No. 2, Winter, 1968. pp. 41-49.

working together can provide the type of continuous comprehensive treatment and supportive program which has so long been missing in the world of criminal rehabilitation. Neither agency can accomplish this task alone, but together they can providing a continuum of complementary services that reach far beyond all previous efforts.

Such is the challenge to both corrections and higher education alike. One alternative would be to continue to sit idly by while a growing number of bright, highly motivated youth grow in their hatred of a system which they feel has denied them every chance at success. Another involves removing the shackles of custom and tapping the resevoir of talent which lies encamped behind our prison walls. The future effectiveness of all correctional rehabilitative efforts may very well be determined by which alternative is selected.

Bibliography

Adams, Stuart College Level Instruction in U.S. Prisons, Berkeley: University of California School of Criminology, January, 1968.

McCabe, M. Patrick, "Correctional Education in the United States," Project NewGate Publication, Federal Youth Center, Ashland, Kentucky, 1970.

———and Robert Atchley "A New Approach to the Treatment of Offenders," Sociological Focus, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 41-49.

Morris, D.W. "The University's Role in Prison Education," Nebraska Law Review, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 542-571, 1966.

"The Shame of the Prisons," Time, January 18, 1971, p. 48.

U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1970 Jail Census, p. 1.